

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Gail Harper,

NO. C 11-01306 JW

Plaintiff,

**ORDER SETTING MARCH 12, 2012 FOR  
HEARING OF PENDING MOTIONS**

v.

Ryan Luginbaur, et al.,

Defendants.

A hearing on City Defendants'<sup>1</sup> Anti-SLAPP Motion<sup>2</sup> is currently scheduled for March 5, 2012. On February 8, 2012, counsel for City Defendants notified the Court that he is unavailable on March 5, 2012, and requested that the Court reschedule the hearing for a date after March 7, 2012.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> City Defendants are: George Gascón ("Gascón"), an individual and as an agent of the San Francisco Police Department; Anna Brown ("Brown"), an individual and as an agent of the San Francisco Police Department; Carl Tennenbaum a.k.a. Carl Tee or Carl T ("Tennenbaum"), an individual and as an agent of the San Francisco Police Department; San Francisco Police Department ("SFPD"); and City and County of San Francisco ("San Francisco") (collectively, "City Defendants").

<sup>2</sup> (Special Motion to Strike Certain State Law Causes of Action Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 425.16 by Defendants City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Police Department, Former Chief of Police George Gascón, Carl Tennenbaum, and Anna Brown, hereafter, "Motion," Docket Item No. 94.)

<sup>3</sup> (Notice of Unavailability of Defense Counsel for March 5, 2012 Hearing on Defendants' Anti-SLAPP Motion, Docket Item No. 99.)


1 On February 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Recuse contending that Chief Judge Ware should  
2 recuse himself from this case.<sup>4</sup>

3 Upon review, and in light of City Defendants' counsel's unavailability for the March 5  
4 hearing and the recently noticed Motion to Recuse, the Court finds good cause both: (1) to continue  
5 the hearing on City Defendants' Anti-SLAPP Motion; and (2) to set an expedited hearing date for  
6 Plaintiff's Motion to Recuse to coincide with the hearing on the Anti-SLAPP Motion. Accordingly,  
7 the Court ORDERS as follows:

8 (1) The hearing on City Defendants' Anti-SLAPP Motion is CONTINUED to **March 12,**  
9 **2012 at 9 a.m.**

10 (2) The Court sets **March 12, 2012 at 9 a.m.** for a hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to  
11 Recuse. On or before **March 1, 2012**, any party wishing to file an Opposition to the  
12 Motion to Recuse shall file such an Opposition. On or before **March 5, 2012**,  
13 Plaintiff shall file her Reply, if any.

14  
15  
16 Dated: February 27, 2012

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES WARE  
United States District Chief Judge

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>4</sup> (Plaintiff's Motion to Recuse Judge Ware, hereafter, "Motion to Recuse," Docket Item No.  
28 104.) Plaintiff did not notice her Motion to Recuse for any date in particular.

**THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

Cherokee Dawn-Marie Melton melton@kerrwagstaffe.com  
David Jerome Kennedy davidjkennedyatty68v@gmail.com  
Edward Joseph Rodzewich Edward.Rodzewich@farmersinsurance.com  
Gail Ellen Harper crimlaw5@gmail.com  
James Matthew Wagstaffe wagstaffe@kerrwagstaffe.com  
Joshua Seth White joshua.white@sfgov.org  
Matthew Robert Halloran mhalloran@bledsoelaw.com  
Richard Michael Lieberman michael@spark84.com  
Richard S. Diestel rdiestel@bledsoelaw.com

**Dated: February 27, 2012**

**Richard W. Wieking, Clerk**

**By: /s/ JW Chambers**  
**Susan Imbriani**  
**Courtroom Deputy**